arXiv:1702.04310v1 [math.OC] 14 Feb 2017

OPTIMAL CONTROL FOR NONLINEAR HYBRID SYSTEMS VIA CONVEX RELAXATIONS

PENGCHENG ZHAO*, SHANKAR MOHAN†, AND RAM VASUDEVAN*

Abstract. This paper considers the optimal control for hybrid systems whose trajectories transition between distinct subsystems when state-dependent constraints are satisfied. Though this class of systems is useful while modeling a variety of physical systems undergoing contact, the construction of a numerical method for their optimal control has proven challenging due to the combinatorial nature of the state-dependent switching and the potential discontinuities that arise during switches. This paper constructs a convex relaxation-based approach to solve this optimal control problem. Our approach begins by formulating the problem in the space of relaxed controls, which gives rise to a linear program whose solution is proven to compute the globally optimal controller. This conceptual program is solved by constructing a sequence of semidefinite programs whose solutions are proven to converge from below to the true solution of the original optimal control problem. Finally, a method to synthesize the optimal controller is developed. Using an array of examples, the performance of the proposed method is validated on problems with known solutions and also compared to a commercial solver.

1. Introduction. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a finite set of labels and $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ a compact, convex, nonempty set. Let X_i be a bounded, compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ for some $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $F_i : [0,T] \times X_i \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ be a vector field on X_i for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, which defines a *controlled hybrid system*. That is given an initial condition $x_0 \in X_j$ for some $j \in \mathcal{I}$, $T > 0$, and control input $u : [0,T] \times U$, the flow of the system satisfies the vector field F_j almost everywhere until either the total time of evolution is T, the trajectory hits a guard, $G_{(j,j')} \subset X_j$ of the system for some $j' \in \mathcal{I}$, or the trajectory hits the boundary of X_j. If the trajectory hits a guard, then the trajectory is re-initialized according to a reset map, $R_{(j,j')} : G_{(j,j')} \to X_{j'}$, and the flow proceeds from this new point according to the vector field $F_{j'}$ as described earlier This notion of execution is formalized in Algorithm 1.

Let $H : \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} X_i \to \mathbb{R}$ and $h : [0,T] \times \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} X_i \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ represent the terminal and incremental cost, respectively, which can be distinct for each subsystem. Let $X_{T_i} \subset X_i$ represent some terminal constraint for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ Given an initial condition $x_0 \in X_j$, this paper is interested in solving the the following optimal control problem:

$$\inf \Big\{ \int_0^T h\left(t, x(t), u(t)\right) dt + H\left(x(T)\right) \;\Big|\; u : [0,T] \to U,\; x : [0,T] \xrightarrow[u,\; x(0)=(x_0,j)]{Algorithm\ 1} \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} X_i, \text{ and } x(T) \in \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} X_{T_i} \Big\}. \tag{1}$$

The optimization problem defined in (1) is numerically challenging to solve since transitions occur between the distinct dynamical systems due to state-dependent constraints, which may give rise to discontinuities in the solution. This has rendered the immediate application of derivative-based algorithms to solve this problem impossible. As a result, this problem has typically been numerically solved by fixing the sequence of transitions between subsystems. To overcome the limitations of these existing numerical approaches, this paper first presents a conceptual, infinite dimensional linear program over measures, (P), that is proven in Theorem 12 to compute the global optimum of (1). Subsequently, this paper describes a sequence of implementable, semidefinite programming-based relaxations, (P_k), of the infinite dimensional linear program, which are proven in Theorem 17 to converge monotonically from below to the solution to (1).

1.1. Related Work. Controlled hybrid dynamical systems have been used to describe the dynamics of a variety of physical systems in which the evolution of the system undergoes sudden changes due to the satisfaction of state-dependent constraints such as in bipeds [43], automotive sub-systems [16], aircraft control [36], and biological systems [14]. Given the practical applications of such systems, the development of algorithms to perform optimal control of hybrid systems has drawn considerable interest amongst both theoreticians and practitioners.

The theoretical development of both necessary and sufficient conditions for the optimal control of hybrid controlled systems has been considered using extensions of the Pontryagin Maximum Principle [30, 34, 37]

*Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA (pczhao@umich.edu, ramv@umich.edu)

†Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA (elemsn@umich.edu)

and Dynamic Programming [9, 12, 33], respectively. Recent work has even linked these pair of theoretical approaches for hybrid systems [29]. Typically these theoretical developments have focused their attention to systems where the sequence of transitions between the systems have been known *a priori*. As a result, practitioners have typically fixed the sequence of transitions and applied gradient-based methods to perform local optimization over the time spent and control applied within each subsystem [15, 18, 35, 44].

More recent work has focused on the development of numerical optimal control techniques for mechanical systems undergoing contact without specifying the ordering of visited subsystems. For mechanical systems, state-dependent switching arises due to the effect of unilateral constraints. One approach to address the optimal control problem has focused on the construction of a novel notion of derivative [28]. Though this method still requires fixing the total number of visited subsystems, assuming *a priori* knowledge of the visited subsystems, and performs optimization only over the initial condition, this gradient-based approach is able to find the locally optimal ordering of subsystems under certain regularity conditions on the nature of contact. Other approaches have relaxed satisfaction of the unilateral constraint directly and instead focused on treating constraint satisfaction as a continuous decision variable that can be optimized using traditional numerical methods to find local minima [32, 42, 45].

This paper focuses on developing a numerical approach to find the global optimal to the hybrid optimal control problem. Our method relies on treating the optimal control problem in the relaxed sense wherein the original problem is lifted to the space of measures [6, 23]. In the instance of classical dynamical systems, this lifting renders the optimal control problem linear in the space of relaxed controls [5]; however, there were few numerical methods to tackle this relaxed problem directly.

Recent developments in algebraic geometry have made it possible to solve this lifted optimal control problem for classical dynamical systems by relying on moment-based relaxations [25]. By solving the problem over truncated moment sequences, it is possible to transform the optimal control problem into either a finite-dimensional linear or finite-dimensional semidefinite program. Either transformation of the relaxed problem is proven to provide a lower bound on the optimal cost. In fact, this bound converges to the true optimal cost as the moment sequence extends to infinity under the assumption that the incremental cost is convex in control. Recent work has also shown how the optimal control policy can be extracted for systems that are affine in control [22, 46]. Unfortunately this relaxed control formulation for controlled hybrid systems, the subsequent development of a numerically implementable convex relaxation, and optimal control synthesis have remained unaddressed.

Note that the focus of this paper is on the development of an optimal control approach for hybrid systems with state-dependent rather than controlled switching. In particular, after state-dependent switching, the state is allowed to change in a discontinuous manner. This is typically not allowed for systems with just controlled switching. For this class of systems with controlled switching, there have been a variety of numerical methods proposed to perform optimal control [4, 11, 13, 21, 38, 39, 41].

1.2. Contributions and Organization. The contributions of this paper are three-fold: first, Section 4 provides a conceptual infinite dimensional linear programming-based approach that is proven to solve (1); second, Section 5 presents a numerically implementable semidefinite programming-based sequence of relaxations to this infinite dimensional linear program that is proven to generate a sequence of convergent lower bounds to the true optimal cost of (1); finally Section 5 provides a method to generate a sequence of controllers that converge to the true optimal control of (1).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes in detail the class of systems under consideration and defines their executions, Section 3 describes how to lift executions of the hybrid system to the space of measures, Section 6 describes how to extend the optimal control approach to free final time problems, and Section 7 illustrates the efficacy of the proposed method on a variety of systems.

2. Preliminaries. In this section, we introduce the notation used throughout the remainder of this paper, define controlled hybrid systems, and formulate the optimal control problem of interest. We make substantial use of measure theory in this paper, and the unfamiliar reader may refer to [7] for an introduction.

2.1. Notation. Given an element $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $[y]_i$ denote the i-th component of y. We use the same convention for elements belonging to any multidimensional vector space. Let $\mathbb{R}[y]$ denote the ring of real polynomials in the variable y. Let $\mathbb{R}_k[y]$ denote the space of real valued multivariate polynomials of total degree less than or equal to k.

Let $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a family of non-empty sets indexed by i, the *disjoint union* of this family is $\coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i =$

$\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(A_i \times \{i\})$. Let $\iota_i : A_i \to \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i$ be the canonical injection defined as $\iota_i(x) = (x, i)$ whose inverse we denote by $\pi_i : \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i \to A_i \cup \{\varnothing\}$. Note that $\pi_i(\iota_j(x)) = \varnothing$ if $i \neq j$. For the sake of convenience, we denote $x_i := \pi_i(x)$ for the remainder of the paper. We similarly define a projection operator onto the indexing set $\lambda : \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i \to \mathcal{I}$ such that $\lambda(\iota_i(x)) = i$.

Suppose K is a compact Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, then we let $C(K)$ be the space of continuous functions on K and $\mathcal{M}(K)$ be the space of finite signed Radon measure on K, whose positive cone $\mathcal{M}_+(K)$ is the space of unsigned Radon measures on K. Since any measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ can be viewed as an element of the dual space to $C(K)$, the duality pairing of μ on a test function $v \in C(K)$ is:

$$\langle \mu, v \rangle := \int_K v(z)\mu(z). \tag{2}$$

For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(K)$, we let the support of μ be denoted as $\mathrm{spt}(\mu)$. A probability measure is a non-negative, unsigned measure whose integral is one. For the sake of convenience, we denote the dual to a vector space V as V'.

2.2. Controlled Hybrid Systems. Motivated by [10], we define the class of *controlled hybrid systems* of interest in the remainder of this paper:

Definition 1. *A* controlled hybrid system *is a tuple* $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}, U, \mathcal{FG}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$*, where:*

- $\mathcal{I}$ *is a finite set indexing the discrete states of* $\mathcal{H}$*;*
- $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}$ *is a set of edges, forming a directed graph structure over* $\mathcal{I}$*;*
- $\mathcal{D} = \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} X_i$ *is a disjoint union of domains, where each* X_i *is a compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$*, and* $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$*;*
- U *is a compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}^m$ *that describes the range of control inputs, where* $m \in \mathbb{N}$*;*
- $\mathcal{F} = \{F_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ *is the set of vector fields, where each* $F_i : \mathbb{R} \times X_i \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ *is the vector field defining the dynamics of the system on* X_i*;*
- $\mathcal{S} = \coprod_{e\in\mathcal{E}} S_e$ *is a disjoint union of guards, where each* $S_{(i,i')} \subset \partial X_i$ *is a compact, co-dimension 1 guard defining a state-dependent transition to* $X_{i'}$*; and,*
- $\mathcal{R} = \{R_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}}$ *is a set of reset maps, where each map* $R_{(i,i')} : S_{(i,i')} \to X_{i'}$ *defines the transition from guard* $S_{(i,i')}$ *to* $X_{i'}$*.*

For convenience, we refer to controlled hybrid systems as just hybrid systems, and we refer to a vertex within the graph structure associated with a controlled hybrid system as a *mode*.

Even though the range space of control inputs are assumed to be the same in each mode, this is not restrictive since we can always concatenate all the control inputs in different modes. The compactness of each X_i ensures the optimization problem defined in Section 2.3 is well-posed. To avoid any ambiguity during transitions, we make the following assumptions:

Assumption 2. Guards do not intersect, i.e.,

$$S_e \cap S_{e'} = \varnothing, \quad \forall e, e' \in \mathcal{E}. \tag{3}$$

Assumption 3. The vector field F_i has nonzero normal component on the boundary of X_i.

Assumption 2 ensures at most one transition can be executed at a time, and Assumption 3 implies transition always happens when a trajectory reaches a guard (i.e., no grazing).

Next, we define an *execution* of a hybrid system up to time $T > 0$ via construction in Algorithm 1. Step 1 initializes the execution at a given point (x_0, i) at time $t = 0$. Step 3 defines ϕ to be the maximal integral curve of F_i under the control u beginning from the initial point. Step 4 defines the execution on a finite interval as the curve ϕ with associated index i. As described in Steps 5 - 7, the trajectory terminates when it either reaches the terminal time T or hits $\partial X_i \backslash \bigcup_{(i,i')\in\mathcal{E}} S_{(i,i')}$ where no transition is defined. Steps 8 and 9 define a discrete transition to a new domain using a reset map where evolution continues again as a classical dynamical system by returning to Step 3. Note that for any execution x and any $t \in [0, T]$, we have $x(t) = (x_i(t), \lambda(x(t)))$.

Hybrid systems can suffer from Zeno executions, i.e. executions that undergo an infinite number of discrete transitions in a finite amount of time. Since the state of the trajectory after the Zeno occurs may not be well defined [1], we do not consider systems with Zeno executions:

Assumption 4. $\mathcal{H}$ has no Zeno execution.

Algorithm 1 Execution of Hybrid System $\mathcal{H}$

Require: $t = 0$, $T > 0$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $(x_0, i) \in \mathcal{D}$, and $u : \mathbb{R} \to U$ Lebesgue measurable.

Set $x(0) = (x_0, i)$.
loop
  Let $\phi : I \to X_i$ be an absolutely continuous function such that:
    (i) $\dot{\phi}(s) = F_i(s, \phi(s), u(s))$ for almost every $s \in I$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $I \subset [t, T]$ with $(\phi(t), i) = x(t)$ and
    (ii) for any other $\hat{\phi} : \hat{I} \to X_i$ satisfying (i) and (ii), $\hat{I} \subset I$.
  Let $t' = \sup I$ and $x(s) = (\phi(s), i)$ for each $s \in [t, t')$.
  if $t' = T$, **or** $\nexists (i, i') \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\phi(t') \in S_{(i,i')}$ **then**
    Stop.
  end if
  Let $(i, i') \in \mathcal{E}$ be such that $\phi(t') \in S_{(i,i')}$.
  Set $x(t') = R_{(i,i')}(\phi(t'))$, $t = t'$, and $i = i'$.
end loop

2.3. Problem Formulation. This paper is interested in finding a pair (x, u) satisfying Algorithm 1 with a given initial condition x_0, that reaches a user-specified target set while minimizing a user-specified cost function. To formulate this problem, we first define *the target set*, $X_T \subset \mathcal{D}$, as:

$$X_T = \coprod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X_{T_i}, \tag{4}$$

where X_{T_i} is a compact subset of X_i for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Next, we define the system trajectories and control actions of interest. Given a real number $T > 0$ and an initial point $(x_0, j) \in \mathcal{D}$, a pair of functions (x, u) satisfying Algorithm 1 is called an *admissible pair* if $x(T) \in X_T$. The trajectory in this instance is called an *admissible trajectory* and the control input is called an *admissible control*. The time T at which the admissible trajectory reaches the target set is called the *terminal time*. For convenience, we denote the space of admissible trajectories and controls by $\mathcal{X}_T$ and $\mathcal{U}_T$, respectively. The space of admissible pairs is denoted as $\mathcal{P}_T \subset \mathcal{X}_T \times \mathcal{U}_T$.

For any admissible pair (x, u), the associated cost is defined as:

$$J(x, u) = \int_0^T h_{\lambda(x(t))}\left(t, x_{\lambda(x(t))}(t), u(t)\right) dt + H_{\lambda(x(T))}\left(x_{\lambda(x(T))}(T)\right) \tag{5}$$

where $h_i : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ and $H_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \to \mathbb{R}$ are measurable functions for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Our goal is to find an admissible pair that minimizes (5), which we refer to as *Hybrid Optimal Control Problem (HOCP)*:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{(x,u) \in \mathcal{P}_T} \quad & \int_0^T h_{\lambda(x(t))}\left(t, x_{\lambda(x(t))}(t), u(t)\right) dt + H_{\lambda(x(T))}\left(x_{\lambda(x(T))}(T)\right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x : [0, T] \to \mathcal{D} \text{ and } u : [0, T] \to U \text{ defined via Algorithm 1} \\ & x(T) \in X_T. \end{aligned} \tag{HOCP}$$

Note (1) and $(HOCP)$ are identical, but we have emphasized the indexing set in the cost in $(HOCP)$ to highlight that the costs can be chosen in a mode-independent fashion. The optimal cost of $(HOCP)$ is defined as:

$$J^* = \inf_{(x,u) \in \mathcal{P}_T} J(x, u). \tag{6}$$

3. The Hybrid Liouville Equation. It is difficult to directly solve $(HOCP)$ over the space of admissible trajectories for various reasons. First, the cost function and constraints may be nonlinear and non-convex, respectively, therefore global optimality is not guaranteed for gradient-descent methods. Second, in the instance of hybrid systems, typically the sequence of transitions between modes must be specified.

To address these limitations, this section constructs measures whose supports' model the evolution of families of trajectories, an equivalent form of J, and an equivalent form of Algorithm 1 in the space of measures. These transformations make a convex formulation of $(HOCP)$ feasible.

To begin, consider again the projection x_i of an admissible trajectory x onto X_i. Define the *occupation measure* in mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ associated with x, denoted as $\mu^i(\cdot \mid x) \in \mathcal{M}_+([0,T] \times X_i)$, as:

$$\mu^i(A \times B \mid x) := \int_0^T I_{A\times B}(t, x_i(t))\, dt \tag{7}$$

for all subsets $A \times B$ in the Borel σ-algebra of $[0,T] \times X_i$, where $I_{A\times B}(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function on a set $A \times B$. Note that $x_i(t)$ may not be defined for all $t \in [0,T]$, but we use the same notation and let $I_{A\times B}(t, x_i(t)) = 0$ whenever $x_i(t) = \varnothing$. The quantity $\mu^i(A \times B \mid x)$ is equal to the amount of time the graph of the trajectory, $(t, x_i(t))$, spends in $A \times B$.

Similarly, define the *initial measure*, $\mu_0^i(\cdot \mid x) \in \mathcal{M}_+(X_i)$, as:

$$\mu_0^i(B \mid x) := I_B(x_i(0)), \tag{8}$$

for all subsets B in the Borel σ-algebra of X_i; define the *terminal measure*, $\mu_T^i(\cdot \mid x) \in \mathcal{M}_+(X_{T_i})$, as:

$$\mu_T^i(B \mid x) := I_B(x_i(T)), \tag{9}$$

for all subsets B in the Borel σ-algebra of X_{T_i}; and define the *guard measure*, $\mu^{S_{(i,i')}}(\cdot \mid x) \in \mathcal{M}_+([0,T] \times S_{(i,i')})$, as:

$$\mu^{S_{(i,i')}}(A \times B \mid x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \exists t \in A, \text{ s.t. } x_i(t) \in B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

for all subsets $A \times B$ in the Borel σ-algebra of $[0,T] \times S_{(i,i')}$, given any pair $(i,i') \in \mathcal{E}$.

If the admissible control u associated with x according to Algorithm 1 is also given, define the occupation measure in mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ associated with the pair (x,u), denoted as $\mu^i(\cdot \mid x,u) \in \mathcal{M}_+([0,T] \times X_i \times U)$, as:

$$\mu^i(A \times B \times C \mid x,u) := \int_0^T I_{A\times B\times C}(t, x_i(t), u(t))\, dt \tag{11}$$

for all subsets $A \times B \times C$ in the Borel σ-algebra of $[0,T] \times X_i \times U$. For notational convenience, it is useful to collect the initial, average, final, and guard occupation measures in each mode into a single distinct object. That is, define $\mu_0^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot\mid, x, u) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{D})$ as $\mu_0^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot, i \mid, x, u) := \mu_0^i(\cdot \mid x, u)$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. For the sake of convenience, we also refer to $\mu_0^{\mathcal{I}}$ as an initial measure and write mu_0^i when we refer to the ith slice of $\mu_0^{\mathcal{I}}$. We define $\mu^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot \mid x,u) \in \mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{D}\times U)$, $\mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot \mid x,u) \in \mathcal{M}_+(X_T)$, and $\mu^{\mathcal{S}}(\cdot \mid x,u) \in \mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{S})$ in a similar fashion and refer to them in a similar way.

Using the notion of occupation measure and terminal measure, we may now rewrite the cost function J as a linear function on measures:

Lemma 5. *Let $\mu^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot \mid x,u)$ and $\mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot \mid x)$ be the occupation measure and terminal measure associated with the pair (x,u), respectively. Then the cost function can be expressed as:*

$$J(x,u) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \mu^i(\cdot \mid x,u), h_i \rangle + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \mu_T^i(\cdot \mid x), H_i \rangle \tag{12}$$

Proof. Notice that h_i and H_i are measurable, and the rest follows directly from (5), (9), and (11). ∎

Despite the cost function potentially being a nonlinear function for the admissible pair in the space of functions, the analogous cost function over the space of measures is linear. In fact, a similar analogue holds true for the dynamics of the system. That is, the occupation measure associated with an admissible pair satisfies a linear equation over measures. To formulate this linear equation over measures, let $\mathcal{L}_i : C^1([0,T] \times X_i) \to C([0,T] \times X_i \times U)$ be a linear operator which acts on a test function v as:

$$\mathcal{L}_i v = \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_k} [F_i(t,x,u)]_k, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \tag{13}$$

Using the dual relationship between measures and functions, we define $\mathcal{L}_i' : C([0,T]\times X_i\times U)' \to C^1([0,T]\times X_i)'$ as the adjoint operator of $\mathcal{L}_i$, satisfying:

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_i'\mu, v\rangle = \langle \mu, \mathcal{L}_i v\rangle = \int_{[0,T]\times X_i\times U} \mathcal{L}_i v(t,x)\, d\mu(t,x,u), \quad \forall i\in\mathcal{I} \tag{14}$$

for all $\mu\in\mathcal{M}([0,T]\times X_i\times U)$ and $v\in C^1([0,T]\times X_i)$.

In fact, each of these adjoint operators can describe the evolution of trajectories of the system within each mode [25]. However in the instance of hybrid systems trajectories may not just begin evolution within a mode at $t=0$. Instead a trajectory can enter mode $i\in\mathcal{I}$ either by starting from some point in X_i at $t=0$, or by hitting a guard $S_{(i',i)}$ for some $(i',i)\in\mathcal{E}$ and subsequently transitioning to a point in X_i. Similarly a trajectory can terminate in mode $i\in\mathcal{I}$ either by reaching terminal time T, or by hitting a guard $S_{(i,i')}$ for some $(i,i')\in\mathcal{E}$ and transitioning away. As a result to describe trajectories of a controlled hybid system using measures one must rely on the following result:

Lemma 6. *Given an admissible pair (x,u), its initial measure, occupation measure, terminal measure, and guard measure, satisfy the following linear equation over measures:*

$$\delta_0\otimes\mu_0^i(\cdot\mid x) + \mathcal{L}_i'\mu^i(\cdot\mid x,u) + \sum_{(i',i)\in\mathcal{E}} R_{*,(i',i)}\mu^{S_{(i',i)}}(\cdot\mid x) = \delta_T\otimes\mu_T^i(\cdot\mid x) + \sum_{(i,i')\in\mathcal{E}}\mu^{S_{(i,i')}}(\cdot\mid x), \quad \forall i\in\mathcal{I} \tag{15}$$

where $R_{*,(i,i')}$ is the pushforward measure corresponding to the reset map between modes i and i' and the linear operator equation (15) holds in the sense that:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\mu_0^i(\cdot\mid x), v(0,\cdot)\rangle + \langle\mu^i(\cdot\mid x,u), \mathcal{L}_i v\rangle + \\ + \sum_{(i',i)\in\mathcal{E}}\langle\mu^{S_{(i',i)}}(\cdot\mid x), v(\cdot, R_{(i',i)}(\cdot))\rangle = \langle\mu_T^i(\cdot\mid x), v(T,\cdot)\rangle + \sum_{(i,i')\in\mathcal{E}}\langle\mu^{S_{(i,i')}}(\cdot\mid x), v\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for all test functions $v\in C^1([0,T]\times X_i)$.

Proof. This lemma follows from [27, Equation (16), (21), Lemma 9] applied to the cases with no parametric uncertainty. ∎

Now one can ask whether the converse relationship holds: do measures that satisfy (15) always coincide with trajectories generated by Algorithm 1? More explicitly, do an arbitrary set of measures, $\mu_0^{\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{D})$, $\mu^{\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{D}\times U)$, $\mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{M}_+(X_T)$, and $\mu^{\mathcal{S}}\in\mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{S})$, that satisfy (15) correspond to an initial measure, $\mu_0^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot\mid x,u)$, occupation measure, $\mu^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot\mid x,u)$, terminal measure, $\mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}(\cdot\mid x,u)$, and guard measure, $\mu^{\mathcal{S}}(\cdot\mid x,u)$? To answer this question, we first consider a family of admissible trajectories modeled by a non-negative measure $\rho\in\mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}_T)$, and define an *average occupation measure* $\zeta^i\in\mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times X_i)$ in each mode $i\in\mathcal{I}$ for the family of trajectories as:

$$\zeta^i(A\times B) := \int_{\mathcal{X}_T}\mu^i(A\times B\mid x(\cdot))\, d\rho(x(\cdot)), \tag{17}$$

for any $i\in\mathcal{I}$; an *average terminal measure*, $\zeta_T^i\in\mathcal{M}_+(X_T)$, by

$$\zeta_T^i(B) := \int_{\mathcal{X}_T}\mu_T^i(B\mid x(\cdot))\, d\rho(x(\cdot)), \tag{18}$$

for any $i\in\mathcal{I}$; and an *average guard measure*, $\zeta^{S_{(i,i')}}\in\mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times S_{(i,i')})$, by

$$\zeta^{S_{(i,i')}}(A\times B) := \int_{\mathcal{X}_T}\mu^{S_{(i,i')}}(A\times B\mid x(\cdot))\, d\rho(x(\cdot)) \tag{19}$$

for any $(i,i')\in\mathcal{E}$. Now we may formally give the converse version of Lemma 6:

Lemma 7. *Let $\mu_0^{\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{D})$, $\mu^{\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{D}\times U)$, $\mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{M}_+(X_T)$, and $\mu^{\mathcal{S}}\in\mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{S})$ satisfy* the Hybrid Liouville Equation *, which is defined as:*

$$\delta_0\otimes\mu_0^i + \mathcal{L}_i'\mu^i + \sum_{(i',i)\in\mathcal{E}} R_{*,(i',i)}\mu^{S_{(i',i)}} = \delta_T\otimes\mu_T^i + \sum_{(i,i')\in\mathcal{E}}\mu^{S_{(i,i')}} \tag{20}$$

for each $i\in\mathcal{I}$. Then:

1. *The measure μ^i can be disintegrated as:*

$$d\mu^i(t,x,u) = d\nu^i(u \mid t,x)\, d\bar{\mu}^i(t,x) = d\nu^i(u \mid t,x)\, d\mu^i(x \mid t)\, dt \tag{21}$$

where $\bar{\mu}^i$ is the (t,x)-marginal of μ, $\nu^i(\cdot \mid t,x)$ is a stochastic kernel on U given $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times X_i$, and $\mu^i(\cdot \mid t)$ is a stochastic kernel on X_i given $t \in [0,T]$. Furthermore, those measures are related by:

$$\mu^i(\cdot \mid 0) = \mu_0^i \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^i(\cdot \mid T) = \mu_T^i. \tag{22}$$

2. *Let $\nu^i(\cdot \mid t,x)$, $\mu^i(\cdot \mid t)$ be defined as in (21). There exists a non-negative measure $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}_T)$ supported on a family of admissible trajectories θ that satisfy the differential equation:*

$$\dot{\theta}_i(t) = \int_U F_i(t,\theta_i(t),u)\, d\nu^i(u \mid t,\theta_i(t)) \in \text{conv } F_i(t,\theta_i(t),U) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \tag{23}$$

almost everywhere, where $\theta_i(t) := \pi_i(\theta(t))$ is the projection of $\theta(t)$ onto X_i, and conv denotes the convex hull, such that for all measurable functions $w_i : X_i \to \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\int_{X_i} w_i(x)\mu^i(x \mid t) = \int_{\mathcal{X}_T} w_i(\theta_i(t))\, d\rho(\theta) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \tag{24}$$

Here we adopt the notation that $w_i(\theta_i(t)) = 0$ where $\theta_i(t) = \varnothing$. Moreover, if each μ_0^i satisfies

$$\mu_0^i = \begin{cases} \delta_{x_0}, & \text{if } x_0 \in X_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

where δ_{x_0} is the Dirac measure at $x = x_0$, then ρ is a probability measure.

3. *Let $\bar{\mu}^i$, ρ be defined as in Equation (21) and (24), respectively. The family of trajectories in the support of ρ starts from x_0 at $t = 0$. Moreover, the average occupation measure, ζ^i, the average terminal measure, ζ_T^i, and the average guard measure, ζ^{S_e} generated by this family of trajectories for each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $e \in \mathcal{E}$ coincide with $\bar{\mu}^i$, μ_T^i, and μ^{S_e}, respectively.*

Proof. Most results in Lemma 7 follows from [27, Lemma 18, Lemma 19], applied to the case without parametric uncertainty. Since the proof of [27, Lemma 19] involves adapting [17, Lemma 3] to each mode of the hybrid system, several results from [17] is also included in Lemma 7.

If Equation (25) is satisfied, ρ is a probability measure because $\int_{\mathcal{X}_T} d\rho = 1$, which follows from plugging $w_i(x) = 1$ in Equation (24). ∎

Lemma 7 illustrates that measures satisfying the Hybrid Liouville Equation correspond to trajectories of the convexified inclusion, $\dot{x}_i(t) \in \text{conv } f(t,x(t),U)$, rather than the original specified dynamics within each mode of the system. To ensure that the there is no gap between the original specified dynamics and the solutions that correspond to the convexified inclusion, we assume the following condition:

Assumption 8. The set $F_i(t,x,U)$ is convex for all t, x, *or* $i \in \mathcal{I}$ or F_i is control affine.

Either condition in the previous assumption is sufficient to ensure that measures satisfying the Hybrid Liouville Equation correspond exactly to trajectories described according to Algorithm 1 [40]. Finally, notice that Corollary 9 provides a link between the solution measures and the underlying control input, which leads to a method capable of performing control synthesis:

Corollary 9. *Suppose the dynamics of the hybrid system in each mode is control affine, i.e.,*

$$F_i(t,x,u) = f_i(t,x) + g_i(t,x)u \tag{26}$$

for all t, x, u, and $i \in \mathcal{I}$, where $f_i : \mathbb{R} \times X_i \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $g_i : \mathbb{R} \times X_i \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m}$. Let $\nu^i(\cdot \mid t,x)$ and ρ be defined as in (21) and (24), respectively. Then $\left(\theta(\cdot), \int_U u\, d\nu^{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(u \mid \cdot, \theta_{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(\cdot)\right)$ is an admissible pair for all $\theta \in spt(\rho)$, where

$$\int_U u\, d\nu^i(u \mid t,x) := \begin{bmatrix} \int_U [u]_1\, d\nu^i(u \mid t,x) \\ \int_U [u]_2\, d\nu^i(u \mid t,x) \\ \vdots \\ \int_U [u]_m\, d\nu^i(u \mid t,x) \end{bmatrix} \tag{27}$$

is an $m \times 1$ real vector for each t, x, and $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. For any $\theta \in \mathrm{spt}(\rho)$, (23) can also be written as:

$$\dot{\theta}_i(t) = f_i(t,\theta_i(t)) + g_i(t,\theta_i(t)) \cdot \int_U u \, d\nu^i(u \mid t, \theta_i(t)) \tag{28}$$

for almost every $t \in [0,T]$. Since $\nu^i(\cdot \mid t,x)$ is a stochastic kernel and U is convex, we know

$$\int_U u \, d\nu^i(u \mid t, \theta_i(t)) \in U \tag{29}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Therefore, $(\theta(\cdot), \int_U u \, d\nu^{\lambda_\theta(\cdot)}(u \mid \cdot, \theta_{\lambda_\theta(\cdot)}(\cdot)))$ is an admissible pair. ∎

4. Infinite Dimensional Linear Program. This section reformulates (OCP) as an infinite-dimension al linear program over the space of measures, proves it computes the solution to (OCP), and illustrates how its solution can be used for control synthesis.

Define the optimization problem (P) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\Gamma} \ & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \mu^i, h_i \rangle + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \mu_T^i, H_i \rangle && (P)\\
\text{s.t. } & \delta_0 \otimes \mu_0^i + \mathcal{L}_i' \mu^i + \sum_{(i',i)\in\mathcal{E}} R_{*,(i',i)} \mu^{S_{(i',i)}} = \delta_T \otimes \mu_T^i + \sum_{(i,i')\in\mathcal{E}} \mu^{S_{(i,i')}}, && \forall i \in \mathcal{I},\\
& \mu^i, \mu_T^i \geq 0 && \forall i \in \mathcal{I},\\
& \mu^{S_e} \geq 0 && \forall e \in \mathcal{E}
\end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is taken over a tuple of measures $\Gamma = (\mu^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu^{\mathcal{S}}) \in \mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{D}\times U) \times \mathcal{M}_+(X_T) \times \mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{S})$ and for each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$, μ_0^i is defined as in (25). The dual to problem (P) is given as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{v} \ & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \mu_0^i(x), v_i(0,x) \rangle && (D)\\
\text{s.t. } & \mathcal{L}_i v_i(t,x) + h_i(t,x,u) \geq 0, && \forall i \in \mathcal{I},\ (t,x,u) \in [0,T]\times X_i \times U\\
& v_i(T,x) \leq H_i(x) && \forall i \in \mathcal{I},\ x \in X_{T_i}\\
& v_i(t,x) \leq v_{i'}(t, R_{(i,i')}(x)) && \forall (i,i') \in \mathcal{E},\ (t,x) \in [0,T]\times X_i
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken over the function $v \in C^1([0,T]\times\mathcal{D})$ and for each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$, μ_0^i is defined as in (25). Again, for notational convenience, we denote the $i \in \mathcal{I}$ slice of v using subscript i (i.e. for every $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times X_i$, let $v_i(t,x) = v(t,x,i)$).

Next, we have the following result:

THEOREM 10. *There is no duality gap between (P) and (D).*

Proof. The proof follows from [2, Theorem 3.10]. ∎

Next, we illustrate the (P) is well-posed by proving the existence of optimal solution:

LEMMA 11. *If (P) is feasible, the minimum to (P), p^*, is attained.*

Proof. We prove (i) in a manner similar to that employed in [25, Theorem 2.3(i)]. Let $(\mu^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu^{\mathcal{S}})$ be a feasible solution to (P). By choosing test functions $v_i = 1$ and $v_i = T - t$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we may show the tuple of measures $(\mu^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu^{\mathcal{S}})$ belongs to the unit ball B_1 of $\mathcal{M}([0,T]\times\mathcal{D}\times U) \times \mathcal{M}(X_T) \times \mathcal{M}([0,T]\times\mathcal{S})$. By Banach-Alaoglu theorem, B_1 is weak-* sequentially compact. Since the operators $\mathcal{L}_i'$ and $R_{*,e}$ are continuous, the set of $(\mu^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu_T^{\mathcal{I}}, \mu^{\mathcal{S}})$ satisfying the Hybrid Liouville Equation is a closed subset of $B_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{D}\times U)\times\mathcal{M}_+(X_T)\times\mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times\mathcal{S})$, and therefore is also weak-* sequentially compact. Since the linear functional to be minimized is continuous, (P) is solvable. ∎

Now we prove that (P) solves (OCP):

THEOREM 12. *Let (P) be feasible and suppose $h_i(t,x,\cdot)$ is convex for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times X_i$. Then (P) solves (OCP), i.e., $p^* = J^*$.*

Proof. We first prove p^* is a lower bound of J^* by showing that there exists a feasible solution of (P) that achieves J^* as the cost, and then use Lemma 7 to show p^* cannot be less than J^*.

Suppose (x^*, u^*) is an optimal admissible pair to (OCP). By Lemma 6, its initial measures, occupation measures, terminal measures and guard measures, denoted as $(\xi_0^{\mathcal{I}}, \xi^{\mathcal{I}}, \xi_T^{\mathcal{I}}, \xi^{\mathcal{S}})$, are supported on proper domains and satisfy (20). Furthermore, $\xi_0^i = \mu_0^i$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Therefore, $(\xi^{\mathcal{I}}, \xi_T^{\mathcal{I}}, \xi^{\mathcal{S}})$ is a feasible solution to (P) with cost $J(x^*, u^*) = J^*$, and $p^* \le J^*$ follows.

We next prove $p^* \ge J^*$. Suppose $(\mu^{\mathcal{I}*}, \mu_T^{\mathcal{I}*}, \mu^{\mathcal{S}*})$ are an optimal solution to (P) which exists according to Lemma 11. The optimal tuple satisfies (20). By Lemma 7, there exists a probability measure $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}_T)$ such that $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$ coincides with the occupation measures of a family of admissible trajectories in the support of ρ, when restricted to mode i.

For the sake of simplicity, we abuse notation in the remainder of this proof and define $[\hat{u}_i(t,x)]_j := \int_U [u]_j \, d\nu^{i*}(u \mid t, x)$, for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
q^* &= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left(\int_{[0,T]\times X_i \times U} h_i(t,x,u)\, d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) + \int_{X_T} H_i(x)\, d\mu_T^{i*}(x) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left(\int_{[0,T]\times X_i \times U} h_i(t,x,u)\, d\nu^{i*}(u \mid t,x)\, d\mu^{i*}(x \mid t)\, dt + \int_{X_T} H_i(x)\, d\mu_T^{i*}(x) \right) \\
&\ge \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left(\int_{[0,T]\times X_i} h_i(t,x,\hat{u}_i(t,x))\, d\mu^{i*}(x \mid t)\, dt + \int_{X_T} H_i(x)\, d\mu^{i*}(x \mid T) \right) && (30) \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left(\int_{[0,T]} \int_{\mathcal{X}_T} h_i\left(t, \theta_i(t), \hat{u}_i(t, \theta_i(t))\right)\, d\rho(\theta)\, dt + \int_{\mathcal{X}_T} H_i(\theta_i(T))\, d\rho(\theta) \right) && (31) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}_T} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left(\int_{[0,T]} h_i\left(t, \theta_i(t), \hat{u}_i\left(t, \theta_i(t)\right)\right)\, dt + H_i(\theta_i(T)) \right) d\rho(\theta) && (32) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}_T} \left(\int_{[0,T]} h_{\lambda(\theta(t))}\left(t, \theta_{\lambda(\theta(t))}(t), \hat{u}_{\lambda(\theta(t))}(t, \theta_{\lambda(\theta(t))}(t))\right)\, dt + H_{\lambda(\theta(T))}\left(\theta_{\lambda(\theta(T))}(T)\right) \right) d\rho(\theta) && (33) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}_T} J\left(\theta(\cdot), \hat{u}_{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(\cdot, \theta_{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(\cdot))\right) d\rho(\theta) && (34) \\
&\ge J^* && (35)
\end{aligned}
$$

where (30) is obtained from the convexity of $h_i(t,x,\cdot)$ and the fact that $\nu^{i*}(\cdot \mid t,x)$ is a probability measure; (31) is from Lemma 7; (32) is from Fubini's Theorem; (33) is because we let $h_i = 0$ where $\theta_i(t)$ is undefined; (34) is because $(\theta(\cdot), \hat{u}_{\lambda_\theta(\cdot)}(\cdot, \theta_{\lambda_\theta(\cdot)}(\cdot)))$ is an admissible pair (according to Corollary 9); (35) is because ρ is a probability measure. ∎

The previous result provides an extension of the weak formulation in [25] to hybrid systems, and ensures (P) can be solved to find a solution to (OCP) in a convex manner. Next we describe how to perform control synthesis with the solution of (P).

THEOREM 13. *Suppose (P) is feasible, $h_i(t,x,\cdot)$ is convex for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times X_i$, the dynamics of the hybrid system in each mode is control affine, i.e.,*

$$F_i(t,x,u) = f_i(t,x) + g_i(t,x)u \tag{36}$$

for all t, x, u, and $i \in \mathcal{I}$, where $f_i : \mathbb{R} \times X_i \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $g_i : \mathbb{R} \times X_i \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m}$, and the optimal trajectory x^* is unique dt-almost everywhere. Let $\Gamma^* = (\mu^{\mathcal{I}*}, \mu_T^{\mathcal{I}*}, \mu^{\mathcal{S}*})$ be a vector of measures that achieves the infimum of (P), then

1. *One can decompose $\mu^{\mathcal{I}*}$ in each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ as:*

$$d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) = d\nu^{i*}(u \mid t,x) d\bar{\mu}^{i*}(t,x) = d\nu^{i*}(u \mid t,x)\, d\mu^{i*}(x \mid t)\, dt \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \tag{37}$$

   where $\mu_T^{i*} = \mu^{i*}(\cdot \mid T)$ and $\nu^{i*}(\cdot \mid t,x)$ is a stochastic kernel conditioned on the pair (t,x). Moreover, $\bar{\mu}^{i*}(t,x)$ coincides with the occupation measures of x^* in each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ almost everywhere.
2. *For each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$, define:*

$$[\hat{u}_i(t,x)]_j := \int_U [u]_j \, d\nu^{i*}(u \mid t,x), \tag{38}$$

   for every point (t,x) in the support of $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$ where $d\nu^{i*}$ is as in (37). Then $\hat{u}_i(t,x) \in U$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and (t,x) in the support of $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$, and

$$J\left(x^*(\cdot), \hat{u}_{\lambda(x^*(\cdot))}\left(\cdot, x^*_{\lambda(x^*(\cdot))}(\cdot)\right)\right) = J^* \tag{39}$$

3. *There exists a feedback control law, $\tilde{u}_i \in L^1([0,T]\times X_i, U)$ in each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$, such that:*

$$[\tilde{u}_i(t,x)]_j \cdot \int_U d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) = \int_U [u]_j \, d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) \tag{40}$$

for each $j \in \{1,\cdots,m\}$.
Moreover, if we let $\tilde{u}(t,x,i) := \tilde{u}_i(t,x)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times X_i$, then $\tilde{u}$ is an optimal feedback control law, i.e.,

$$J\left(x^*(\cdot), \tilde{u}(\cdot, x^*(\cdot))\right) = J^* \tag{41}$$

Proof.

1. First note that the decomposition of $\mu^{\mathcal{I}*}$ exists as a result of Lemma 7. Using the notation and result within the proof of Theorem 12:

$$J\left(\theta(\cdot), \hat{u}_{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(\cdot, \theta_{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(\cdot))\right) = J^* \tag{42}$$

for any $\theta \in \mathrm{spt}(\rho)$. Therefore every admissible pair $\left(\theta(\cdot), \hat{u}_{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(\cdot, \theta_{\lambda(\theta(\cdot))}(\cdot))\right)$ must be optimal. Since the optimal trajectory x^* is assumed to be unique dt-almost everywhere, we have

$$\theta(t) = x^*(t) \text{ for almost everywhere } t \in [0,T], \quad \forall \theta(\cdot) \in \mathrm{spt}(\rho) \tag{43}$$

According to Lemma 7, $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$ coincides with the occupation measure of the family of admissible trajectories in $\mathrm{spt}(\rho)$. Note the similarity between (7) and (17), therefore $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$ coincides with the occupation measure of x^* in each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ almost everywhere.
2. This follows from Corollary 9, (42), and (43).
3. We prove the first result using Radon-Nikodym Theorem, and the second result can be shown using Theorem 12 and the uniqueness of $\tilde{u}_i$.
For notational convenience, we define measures $\bar{\mu}^{i*}, \eta_j^{i*} \in \mathcal{M}_+([0,T]\times X_i)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{\mu}^{i*} &:= \int_{U_i} d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) \\ d\eta_j^{i*} &:= \int_{U_i} [u]_j \, d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

For each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$, μ^{i*} is σ-finite since it's a Radon measure defined over a compact set, therefore $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$ and η_j^{i*} are also σ-finite. To apply Radon-Nikodym theorem, we need to show η_j^{i*} is absolutely continuous with respect to $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$:
For any Borel measurable set $A\times B \subseteq [0,T]\times X_i$ such that $\bar{\mu}^{i*}(A\times B) = 0$, we have

$$\int_{A\times B\times U_i} d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) = \bar{\mu}^{i*}(A\times B) = 0 \tag{45}$$

Note that μ^{i*} is unsigned measure, therefore μ^{i*} is zero on any measurable subset of $A\times B\times U_i$. This implies

$$\eta_j^{i*}(A\times B) = \int_{A\times B\times U_i} [u]_j \, d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) = 0 \tag{46}$$

As a result of Radon-Nikodym theorem, there exist functions $[\tilde{u}_i]_j \in L^1([0,T]\times X_i, \mathbb{R}_+)$ for each $j \in \{1,\cdots,m_i\}$, such that Equation (40) is satisfied. Such functions $[\tilde{u}_i]_j$ are unique $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$-almost everywhere.
Now we want to show there is a version of $\tilde{u}_i$ whose range is a subset of U. Note that we can disintegrate each μ^{i*} and define $\hat{u}_i$ as in Theorem 12, hence Equation (40) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{u}_i(t,x)]_j \, d\bar{\mu}^{i*}(t,x) &= \left(\int_U [u]_j \, d\nu^{i*}(u \mid t,x)\right) d\bar{\mu}^{i*}(t,x) \\ &= [\hat{u}_i(t,x)]_j \, d\bar{\mu}^{i*}(t,x) \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Since $\hat{u}_i(t,x) \in U$ for all (t,x) in the support of $\bar{\mu}^{i*}$, we may choose $\tilde{u}_i = \hat{u}_i$ such that Equation (40) is satisfied and $\tilde{u}_i \in L^1([0,T] \times X_i, U)$.
Finally, let x^* be the optimal trajectory, and it follows directly from definition that

$$\tilde{u}(t, x^*(t)) = \tilde{u}\left(t, x^*_{\lambda(x^*(t))}(t), \lambda(x^*(t))\right) = \tilde{u}_{\lambda(x^*(t))}\left(t, x^*_{\lambda(x^*(t))}(t)\right) \tag{48}$$

Using Equation (39), we know

$$J\left(x^*(\cdot), \tilde{u}(\cdot, x^*(\cdot))\right) = J\left(x^*(\cdot), \hat{u}_{\lambda(x^*(t))}\left(\cdot, x^*_{\lambda(x^*(\cdot))}(\cdot)\right)\right) = J^* \tag{49}$$

□

Notice that the second result in Theorem 13 requires that we be able to construct the condition measure ν^* to be able to construct a feedback controller. In contrast, the third result within Theorem 13 illustrates how one can construct a feedback controller by computing the Radon-Nikodym derivative using the optimal measures from the solution to (P). As we describe in the next section, this latter result can be utilized directly to construct a sequence of controllers that converge to the optimal control. Finally notice that in the hypothesis of Theorem 13 we do not assume the uniqueness of the optimal control law, i.e., there may exist different control laws u_1 and u_2, such that $J^* = J(x^*, u_1) = J(x^*, u_2)$. In this instance the admissible pairs (x^*, u_1) and (x^*, u_2) are both optimal, and we are interested in finding either of them. Instead we only assume that the optimal trajectory is unique almost-everywhere. As a result, the optimal solution to (P) may not be unique.

5. Numerical Implementation. We compute a solution to the infinite-dimensional problem (P) via a sequence of finite-dimensional approximations formulated as semidefinite programs (SDP)s. These are generated by representing the measures in (P) using a truncated sequence of moments and restricting the functions in (D) to polynomials of finite degree. As illustrated in this section, the solutions to any of the SDPs in this sequence can be used to synthesize an approximation to the optimal controllers. A comprehensive introduction to such moment relaxations can be found in [24].

To formulate this SDP relaxation, we restrict our interest to polynomial hybrid optimal control problems:

Assumption 14. The functions F_i, h_i, and H_i are polynomials, that is, $[F_i]_j \in \mathbb{R}[t,x,u]$, $h_i \in \mathbb{R}[t,x,u]$, and $H_i \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \{1, \cdots, n_i\}$.

Note that in the notation $\mathbb{R}[t,x,u]$, we refer to x as an indeterminate in X_i with dimension n_i. It should not be confused with trajectory of the hybrid system. In addition, for notational convenience, the dimension n_i of x is omitted when it is clear in context.

We also make assumptions about the sets X_i, X_{T_i}, U, and S_e:

Assumption 15. X_i, X_{T_i}, U, and S_e are semi-algebraic sets, i.e.,

$$X_i = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \mid h_{X_{i_j}} \geq 0, h_{X_{i_j}} \in \mathbb{R}[x], \forall j \in \{1, \cdots, n_{X_i}\}\right\}, \tag{50}$$

$$X_{T_i} = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \mid h_{T_{i_j}} \geq 0, h_{T_{i_j}} \in \mathbb{R}[x], \forall j \in \{1, \cdots, n_{T_i}\}\right\}, \tag{51}$$

$$U = \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid h_{U_j} \geq 0, h_{U_j} \in \mathbb{R}[u], \forall j \in \{1, \cdots, n_U\}\right\}, \tag{52}$$

$$S_{(i,i')} = \left\{x \in \partial X_i \mid h_{(i,i')_j} \geq 0, h_{(i,i')_j} \in \mathbb{R}[x], \forall j \in \{1, \cdots, n_{(i,i')}\}\right\} \tag{53}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(i,i') \in \mathcal{E}$.

Since X_i and X_{T_i} are also compact, note that Putinar's condition (see [24]) is satisfied by adding the redundant constraint $M - \|x\|_2^2$ for some large enough M.

To derive the SDP relaxation, we begin with a few preliminaries. Any polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}_k[x]$ can be expressed in the monomial basis as:

$$p(x) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} p_\alpha x^\alpha = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} p_\alpha \cdot (x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}) \tag{54}$$

where α ranges over vectors of non-negative integers such that $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \leq k$, and we denote $\text{vec}(p) = (p_\alpha)_{|\alpha| \leq k}$ as the vector of coefficients of p. Given a vector of real numbers $y = (y_\alpha)$ indexed by α, we define the linear functional $L_y : \mathbb{R}_k[x] \to \mathbb{R}$ as:

$$L_y(p) := \sum_\alpha p_\alpha y_\alpha \tag{55}$$

Note that, when the entries of y are moments of a measure μ:

$$y_\alpha = \int x^\alpha \, d\mu(x), \tag{56}$$

then

$$\langle \mu, p \rangle = \int \left(\sum_\alpha p_\alpha x^\alpha \right) d\mu = L_y(p). \tag{57}$$

If $|\alpha| \le 2k$, the *moment matrix*, $M_k(y)$, is defined as:

$$[M_k(y)]_{\alpha\beta} = y_{(\alpha+\beta)} \tag{58}$$

Given any polynomial $h \in \mathbb{R}_l[x]$ with $l < k$, the *localizing matrix*, $M_k(h, y)$, is defined as:

$$[M_k(h,y)]_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{|\gamma| \le l} h_\gamma y_{(\alpha+\beta)}. \tag{59}$$

Note that the moment and localizing matrices are symmetric and linear in moments y.

5.1. LMI Relaxations and SOS Approximations. An sequence of SDPs approximating (P) can be obtained by replacing constraints on measures with constraints on moments. Since h_i and H_i are polynomials, the objective function of (P) can be written using linear functionals as $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} L_{y_{\mu^i}}(h_i) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} L_{y_{\mu_T^i}}(H_i)$, where y_{μ^i} and $y_{\mu_T^i}$ are the sequence of moments of μ^i and μ_T^i, respectively. The equality constraints in (P) can be approximated by an infinite-dimensional linear system, which is obtained by restricting to polynomial test functions: $v_i(t,x) \in \mathbb{R}[t,x]$, for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$. The positivity constraints in (P) can be replaced with semidefinite constraints on moment and localizing matrices, which guarantees the existence of Borel measures defined on proper domains [24, Theorem 3.8].

A finite-dimensional SDP is then obtained by truncating the degree of moments and polynomial test functions to $2k$. Let $\Xi_\mathcal{I} = \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \mu^i$, $\Xi_\mathcal{E} = \coprod_{e\in\mathcal{E}} \mu^{S_e}$, $\Xi_T = \coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \mu_T^i$, and $\Xi = \Xi_\mathcal{I} \bigcup \Xi_\mathcal{E} \bigcup \Xi_T$. Let $(y_{k,\xi})$ be the sequence of moments truncated to degree $2k$ for each $(\xi, i) \in \Xi$, and let $\mathbf{y}_k$ be a vector of all the sequences $(y_{k,\xi})$. The equality contraints in (P) can then be approximated by a finite-dimensional linear system:

$$A_k(\mathbf{y}_k) = b_k \tag{60}$$

Define the k-th relaxed SDP representation of (P), denoted (P_k), as

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf \quad & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} L_{y_{k,\mu^i}}(h_i) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} L_{y_{k,\mu_T^i}}(H_i) && (P_k)\\
\text{s.t.} \quad & A_k(\mathbf{y}_k) = b_k, \\
& M_k(y_{k,\xi}) \succeq 0 && \forall (\xi,i) \in \Xi, \\
& M_{k_{X_{i_j}}}(h_{X_{i_j}}, y_{k,\mu^i}) \succeq 0 && \forall (j,i) \in \{1,\cdots,n_{X_i}\} \times \mathcal{I}, \\
& M_{k_{U_{i_j}}}(h_{U_j}, y_{k,\mu^i}) \succeq 0 && \forall (j,i) \in \{1,\cdots,n_{U_i}\} \times \mathcal{I}, \\
& M_{k_{S_{e_j}}}(h_{e_j}, y_{k,\xi}) \succeq 0 && \forall (j,\xi,e) \in \{1,\cdots,n_e\} \times \Xi_\mathcal{E}, \\
& M_{k_{T_{i_j}}}(h_{T_{i_j}}, y_{k,\xi}) \succeq 0 && \forall (j,\xi,i) \in \{1,\cdots,n_{T_i}\} \times \Xi_T, \\
& M_{k-1}(h_\tau, y_{k,\xi}) \succeq 0 && \forall (\xi,i) \in \Xi_\mathcal{I} \bigcup \Xi_\mathcal{E}
\end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is taken over the sequences of moments $(y_{k,\xi})$ for each $(\xi,i) \in \Xi$, $h_\tau = t(T-t)$, $k_{X_{i_j}} = k - \lceil \deg(h_{X_{i_j}})/2 \rceil$, $k_{U_{i_j}} = k - \lceil \deg(h_{U_{i_j}})/2 \rceil$, $k_{S_{e_j}} = k - \lceil \deg(h_{e_j})/2 \rceil$, $k_{T_{i_j}} = k - \lceil \deg(h_{T_{i_j}})/2 \rceil$, and $\succeq$ denotes positive semidefiniteness of matrices.

The dual of (P_k) is a Sums-of-Squares (SOS) program denoted by (D_k) for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which is obtained by first restricting the optimization space in (D) to the polynomial functions with degree truncated to $2k$ and by then replacing the non-negativity constraints in (D) with SOS constraints. For notational convenience,

we let x_i be the indeterminate that corresponds to X_i. Define $Q_{2k}(h_{T_{i_1}}, \cdots, h_{T_{i_{n_{T_i}}}}) \subset \mathbb{R}_{2k}[x_i]$ to be the set of polynomials $l \in \mathbb{R}_{2k}[x_i]$ expressible as

$$l = s_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_{T_i}} s_j h_{T_{i_j}} \tag{61}$$

for some polynomials $\{s_j\}_{i=0}^{n_{T_i}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{2k}[x_i]$ that are sums of squares of other polynomials. Every such polynomial is clearly non-negative on X_{T_i}. Similarly, we define $Q_{2k}(h_\tau, h_{X_{i_1}}, \cdots, h_{X_{i_{n_{X_i}}}}, h_{U_1}, \cdots, h_{U_{n_U}}) \subset \mathbb{R}_{2k}[t, x_i, u]$, and $Q_{2k}(h_\tau, h_{(i,i')_1}, \cdots, h_{(i,i')_{n_{(i,i')}}}) \subset \mathbb{R}_{2k}[t, x_i]$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(i, i') \in \mathcal{E}$. Therefore k-th relaxed SDP representation of (D), denoted (D_k) is given as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup\ & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \langle \mu_0^i, v_i(0, \cdot) \rangle && (D_k)\\
\text{s.t. } & \mathcal{L}_i v_i + h_i \in Q_{2k}(h_\tau, h_{X_{i_1}}, \cdots, h_{X_{i_{n_{X_i}}}}, h_{U_1}, \cdots, h_{U_{n_U}}) && \forall i \in \mathcal{I},\\
& -v_i(T, \cdot) + H_i \in Q_{2k}(h_{T_{i_1}}, \cdots, h_{T_{i_{n_{T_i}}}}) && \forall i \in \mathcal{I},\\
& v_{i'} \circ (1, R_{(i,i')}) - v_i \in Q_{2k}(h_\tau, h_{(i,i')_1}, \cdots, h_{(i,i')_{n_{(i,i')}}}) && \forall (i, i') \in \mathcal{E},
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken over polynomials $v_i \in \mathbb{R}_{2k}[t, x]$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

We first prove that these pair of problems are well-posed:

THEOREM 16. *For each $k \in \mathbf{N}$, if (P_k) is feasible, then there is no duality gap between (P_k) and (D_k).*

Proof. This can be proved using Slater's condition (see [8]), which involves noting that (D_k) is bounded below, and then arguing the feasible set has an interior point. ∎

Next, we describe how to extract a polynomial control law from the solution of (P_k). Given moment sequences truncated to $2k$, we want to find an appropriate feedback control law $u_{k,i}^*$ in each mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ with components $[u_{k,i}^*]_j \in \mathbb{R}[t, x]$, such that the analogue of (40) is satisfied, i.e.,

$$\int_{[0,T] \times X_i} t^{\alpha_0} x^\alpha \cdot [u_{k,i}^*]_j(t, x) \int_U d\mu_k^{i*}(t, x, u) = \int_{[0,T] \times X_i} t^{\alpha_0} x^\alpha \cdot \int_U [u]_j \, d\mu_k^{i*}(t, x, u) \tag{62}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$, and $(\alpha_0, \alpha) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^{n_i}$ satisfying $\sum_{l=0}^n \alpha_l \le k$, $\alpha_l \ge 0$. Here μ_k^{i*} is any measure whose truncated moments match $y_{\mu_i}^*$. In fact, when constructing a polynomial control law from the solution of (P_k), these linear equations written with respect to the coefficients of $[u_{k,i}^*]_j$ are expressible in terms of the optimal solution y_{k,μ^i}^*.

To see this, define (t, x)-moment matrix of y_{k,μ^i}^* as:

$$\left[M_k^{(t,x)}(y_{k,\mu^i}^*)\right]_{(\alpha_0,\alpha)(\beta_0,\beta)} = L_{y_{k,\mu^i}^*}(t^{\alpha_0+\beta_0} x^{\alpha+\beta} u^{\mathbf{0}}) = \left[y_{k,\mu^i}^*\right]_{(\alpha_0,\alpha,\mathbf{0})(\beta_0,\beta,\mathbf{0})} \tag{63}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $(\alpha_0, \alpha, \mathbf{0}), (\beta_0, \beta, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^{n_i} \times \{0\}^m$ satisfying $\sum_{l=0}^n \alpha_l \le k$, $\alpha_l \ge 0$, $\sum_{l=0}^n \beta_l \le k$, $\beta_l \ge 0$. Also define a vector b_k^j as

$$\left[b_k^j(y_{k,\mu^i}^*)\right]_\alpha = L_{y_{k,\mu^i}^*}(t^{\alpha_0} x^\alpha \cdot [u]_j) \tag{64}$$

for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$, and $(\alpha_0, \alpha) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^{n_i}$ satisfying $\sum_{l=0}^n \alpha_l \le k$, $\alpha_l \ge 0$. Direct calculation shows Equation (62) is equivalent as the following linear system of equations:

$$M_k^{(t,x)}(y_{k,\mu^i}^*) \operatorname{vec}([u_{k,i}^*]_j) = b_k^j(y_{k,\mu^i}^*) \tag{65}$$

To extract the coefficients of the controller, one needs only to compute the generalized inverse of $M_k^{(t,x)}(y_{k,\mu^i}^*)$, which exists since it is positive semidefinite. Note that the degree of the extracted polynomial control law is dependent on the relaxation order k. Higher relaxation orders lead to higher degree controllers.

5.2. Convergence of Relaxed Problems. Next, we prove the convergence of the pair of approximations:

THEOREM 17. *Let p_k^* and d_k^* denote the infimum of (P_k) and supremum of (D_k), respectively. Then $\{p_k^*\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{d_k^*\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converge monotonically from below to the optimal value of (P) and (D).*

Proof. This theorem can be proved using a similar technique adopted in the proof of [26, Theorem 4.2]. We first establish a lower found of d_k^* by finding a feasible solution to (D_k) for some k, and then show that there exists a convergent subsequence of $\{d_k^*\}_{k=1}^\infty$, by arguing the lower bound can be arbitrarily close to d^* for large enough k. Using Theorem 16, we only need to prove $\{d_k^*\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converge monotonically from below to d^*.

Note that the higher the relaxation order k, the looser the constraint set of the optimization problem (D_k), so $\{d_k^*\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is nond-ecreasing.

Suppose $v \in C^1([0,T]\times\mathcal{D})$ is feasible in (D). For every $\epsilon > 0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}$, set

$$\tilde{v}_i(t,x) := v_i(t,x) + \epsilon t - (1+T)\epsilon \tag{66}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_i\tilde{v}_i = \mathcal{L}_i v_i + \epsilon$, $\tilde{v}_i(T,x) = v_i(T,x) - \epsilon$, and it follows that $\coprod_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\tilde{v}_i$ is strictly feasible in (D) with a margin at least ϵ. Since $[0,T]\times X_i$ and X_i are compact for every $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and by a generalization of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem that allows for the simultaneous uniform approximation of a function and its derivatives by a polynomial [19], we are guaranteed the existence of polynomials $\hat{v}_i$, such that $\|\hat{v}_i - \tilde{v}_i\|_\infty < \epsilon$, and $\|\mathcal{L}_i\hat{v}_i - \mathcal{L}_i\tilde{v}_i\|_\infty < \epsilon$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$. By Putinar's Positivstellensatz [24, Theorem 2.14], those polynomials are strictly feasible for (D_k) for a sufficiently large relaxation order k, therefore $d_k^* \geq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\hat{v}_i(0,x_0) \geq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\tilde{v}_i(0,x_0) - |\mathcal{I}|\epsilon$, where $|\mathcal{I}|$ is the number of elements in $\mathcal{I}$. Also, since $\tilde{v}_i(0,x_0) = v_i(0,x_0) - (1+T)\epsilon$, we have $d_k^* > \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} v_i(0,x_0) - (1+T+|\mathcal{I}|)\epsilon = d^* - (1+T+|\mathcal{I}|)\epsilon$, where $1+T+|\mathcal{I}| < \infty$ is a constant. Using the fact that d^* is non-decreasing and bounded above by d, we know $\{d_k^*\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges to d from below. ∎

Finally we can prove that the sequence of controls extracted as the solution to the linear equation (65) from the sequence of SDPs converges to the optimal control:

THEOREM 18. *Let $\{y_{k,\xi}^*\}_{(\xi,i)\in\Xi}$ be an optimizer of (P_k), and let $\{\mu_k^{i*}\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a set of measures such that the truncated moments of μ_k^{i*} match y_{k,μ^i}^* for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. In addition, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $u_{k,i}^*$ denote the controller constructed by (65), and $\tilde{u}_i$ is the optimal feedback control law in mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$ defined in Theorem 13. Then, there exists a subsequence $\{k_l\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that:*

$$\int_{[0,T]\times X_i} v_i(t,x)[u_{k_l,i}^*]_j(t,x)\,d\mu_{k_l}^{i*}(t,x) \xrightarrow{l\to\infty} \int_{[0,T]\times X_i} v_i(t,x)\,[\tilde{u}_i]_j(t,x)\,d\mu^{i*}(t,x) \tag{67}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $v_i \in C^1([0,T]\times X_i)$, and $j \in \{1,\cdots,m\}$.

Proof. From the proof of [24, Theorem 4.3], if we complete each $y_{k,\xi}^*$ with zeros and make it an infinite vector, then there exists a $y_\xi^* \in l_\infty$ and a subsequence $\{k_l\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that for each $(\xi,i) \in \Xi$, $\lim_{l\to\infty} y_{k_l,\xi}^* = y_\xi^*$ for the weak-* topology $\sigma(l_\infty, l_1)$ of l_∞. Moreover, as a result of [24, Theorem 3.8(b)], for each $(\xi,i) \in \Xi$, y_ξ^* has a finite Borel representing measure, and this set of represented measures, which we denote by $(\mu^{\mathcal{I}*}, \mu_T^{\mathcal{I}*}, \mu^{\mathcal{S}*})$, is an optimizing vector of measures for (P).

Next, consider any polynomial test function $t^{\alpha_0}x^\alpha \in \mathbb{R}[t,x]$, and let r be its degree. Then Equation (40) and (62) are both true for $k > r$. Therefore we only need to show

$$\int_{[0,T]\times X_i} t^{\alpha_0}x^\alpha \cdot \int_U [u]_j\,d\mu_{k_l}^{i*}(t,x,u) \xrightarrow{l\to\infty} \int_{[0,T]\times X_i} t^{\alpha_0}x^\alpha \cdot \int_U [u]_j\,d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u) \tag{68}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Define $w_i(t,x,u) := t^{\alpha_0}x^\alpha \cdot [u]_j \in \mathbb{R}[t,x,u]$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{[0,T]\times X_i\times U} w_i(t,x,u)\left(d\mu_{k_l}^{i*}(t,x,u) - d\mu^{i*}(t,x,u)\right)\\ =&\mathrm{vec}(w_i)\left(y_{k_l,\mu^i}^* - y_{\mu^i}^*\right) \xrightarrow{l\to\infty} 0\end{aligned}$$

where the last argument is true because $\mathrm{vec}(w_i) \in l_1$. Note that the set of polynomials is dense in C^1, therefore Equation (67) is true for all C^1 functions v_i. ∎

6. Extension to Free Final Time Problem. It is useful to sometimes consider the optimal control problem where the system state has to be driven to X_T before a fixed time T_0, and not necessarily remain in X_T afterwards (as opposed to reaching X_T exactly at time T). We refer to this problem as the *free terminal time problem*. We adapt the notation T to denote the first time a trajectory reaches X_T (the terminal time), and an admissible pair (x, u) can be redefined as follows. Given a real number $T_0 > 0$ and a point $(x_0, j) \in \mathcal{D}$, if there exists a T satisfying $0 < T \leq T_0$, a control $u : [0, T] \to U$, and a trajectory $x : [0, T] \to \mathcal{D}$ such that (x, u) satisfies Algorithm 1, and $x(T) \in X_T$ then x is called an *admissible trajectory*, u is called an *admissible control*, and the pair (x, u) is called an *admissible pair*.

In practice this formulation requires, we modify (OCP) by adding in another constraint $0 < T \leq T_0$ since T is a free variable now. The primal LP that solves the free terminal time is obtained by modifying the support of μ_T in (P) to be $[0, T_0] \times X_T$, and substituting $\delta_T \otimes \mu_T$ with μ_T in its first constraint. The only modification to (D) is that the second constraint is imposed for all time $t \in [0, T_0]$ instead of just at time T. All results from the previous sections can be extended to the free-terminal-time case with nearly identical proofs, and the numerical implementation follows in a straightforward manner. When $h_i \equiv 1$ and $H_i \equiv 0$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$ with free terminal time, the (OCP) can be interpreted as a minimum time problem , where the optimal control problem must find an admissible pair (x, u) such that the trajectory reaches the target set as quickly as possible.

7. Examples. This section illustrates the performance of our approach using several examples. Before proceeding, we begin by describing the numerical implementation of our algorithm. First, for each of the systems described below, we denote the range space of control inputs in mode i as U_i. In the implementation, we can always define $U := \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} U_i$ without causing any problems. Second, for each of the optimal control problems, we implement our algorithm using the MOSEK[3] numerical solver in MATLAB and generate a polynomial feedback control law. Third, the trajectory is obtained by plugging the (saturated) polynomial control law back into the system dynamics in each mode and simulating forward using a standard ODE solver with event detection in MATLAB. Once the trajectory hits a guard, another ODE solver is initialized at a new point given by the associated reset map, and the simulation continues in the same way until terminal condition is satisfied. Next, for the sake of comparison, all the examples are solved either analytically (when possible) or using GPOPS-II[31] by iterating through a finite set of of possible transitions. Notice that in this latter instance we must fix the possible sequences of transitions and provide an initial condition, since existing numerical hybrid optimal control algorithms require this information. Finally, all of our experiments are performed on an Intel Xeon, 20 core, 2.60 GHz, 128 GB RAM machine.

7.1. Hybridized Double Integrator. The double integrator is a two-state, single-input linear system. Even though a standard double integrator is a non-hybrid system, we may hybridize it by dividing the domain into two parts, and defining an identity reset map between them as described in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1: Vector fields and domains of each of the modes of the hybridized double integrator

Mode	$i = 1$	$i = 2$
Dynamics	$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u$	$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u$
X_i	$\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 0.3\}$	$\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1^2 + x_2^2 \geq 0.3\}$
U_i	$[-1, 1]$	$[-1, 1]$

Note that X_2 is not compact, but we may impose the additional constraint $\|x(t)\|_\infty \leq N$ on X_2 for some large N [25, Section 5.1]. However, this additional constraint is not enforced in the numerical implementations. We first consider the following minimum time problem: drive the system to the point $(0, 0)$ beginning from $x_0 = (0.3, 1) \in X_1$ in minimum time. We assume the minimum time needed is less than 5 and the problem is set up according to Table 3.

For this system, the optimal admissible pair is analytically computable, which is used as ground truth and compared to the result of our method with degrees of relaxation $k = 6$, $k = 8$, and $k = 12$ in Figure 1. The polynomial control law is saturated so that its value is in U for all time. The cost and computation time are also compared in Table 5.

Table 2: Guards and reset maps of the hybridized double integrator. The rows are modes in which a transition originates, and the columns are modes to which the transition goes.

	Mode 1	Mode 2
Mode 1	N/A	N/A
Mode 2	$S_{(2,1)} = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1^2 + x_2^2 = 0.3\}$ $R_{(2,1)}(x) = x, \quad \forall x \in S_{(2,1)}$	N/A

Table 3: Optimal control problem setup of the hybridized double integrator

	$i = 1$	$i = 2$
h_i	1	1
H_i	0	0
x_0	$(0.3, 1) \in X_1$	N/A
X_{T_i}	$\varnothing$	$\{(0,0)\} \subset X_2$
T_0	5	

Table 4: Problem setup of the hybridized double integrator LQR problem

	$i = 1$	$i = 2$
h_i	$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 20 \cdot u^2$	$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 20 \cdot u^2$
H_i	0	0
x_0	$(1, 1) \in X_1$	N/A
X_{T_i}	$\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 0.3\} = X_1$	$\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1^2 + x_2^2 \geq 0.3\} = X_2$
T	5 or 15	



(a) Control action

(b) Trajectory

Fig. 1: An illustration of the performance of our algorithm on a free final time version of the hybridized double integrator problem. The blue circle indicates the given initial point x_0, and the blue cross shows the target set. The blue line is the analytically computed optimal control, while the red lines of various saturation correspond to control actions generated by our method. When the simulated trajectory does not pass through $(0, 0)$ perfectly, the simulation terminates when the closest point is reached. As the saturation of the color in the illustration increases the corresponding degree of relaxation increases between $2k = 6$ to $2k = 8$ to $2k = 12$. Figure 1a depicts the control action whereas Figure 1b illustrates the resultant trajectory when forward simulated through the system. The moment of transition from mode 2 to mode 1 is indicated by a vertical black solid line in Figure 1a.

Next, we consider an Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) problem on the same hybridized double integrator system, where the goal is to drive the system state towards $(0,0)$ while keeping the control action small for all time $t \in [0,T]$. The problem is set up according to Table 4. To further illustrate we are able to handle different number of modes visited, two cases where $T = 5$ and $T = 15$ are considered. For comparison, the LQR problem is also solved by a standard finite-horizon LQR solver in the non-hybrid case, which we refer to as the ground truth. The results are compared in Figure 2 and Table 5 with degrees of relaxation $2k = 6$, $2k = 8$, and $2k = 12$.



(a) Trajectory, $T = 5$

(b) Trajectory, $T = 15$

Fig. 2: An illustration of the performance of our algorithm on LQR version of the hybridized double integrator problem. The blue circles indicate the given initial point x_0, and the blue dots show the point $(0,0)$. The blue lines are the analytically computed optimal control, while the red lines of various saturation correspond to control actions generated by our method. As the saturation of the color increases the corresponding degree of relaxation increases between $2k = 6$ to $2k = 8$ to $2k = 12$. Figure 2a shows the trajectories when $T = 5$, and Figure 2b shows the trajectories when $T = 15$.

Table 5: Results of the hybridized double integrator examples

		Computation time	Cost returned from optimization	Cost returned from simulation
Minimum time problem with $T_0 = 5$	$2k = 6$	3.1075[s]	2.7781	2.7780 [a]
	$2k = 8$	10.0187[s]	2.7847	2.7845 [a]
	$2k = 12$	170.9319[s]	2.7868	2.7865 [a]
	Ground truth	N/A	2.7889	N/A
LQR problem with $T = 5$	$2k = 6$	2.2299[s]	24.9496	24.9906
	$2k = 8$	8.1412[s]	24.9496	24.9906
	$2k = 12$	198.2826[s]	24.9502	24.9906
	Ground truth	N/A	24.9503	N/A
LQR problem with $T = 15$	$2k = 6$	2.1965[s]	26.1993	26.3428
	$2k = 8$	7.7989[s]	26.1993	26.3438
	$2k = 12$	168.5383[s]	26.1996	26.3435
	Ground truth	N/A	26.2033	N/A

[a] Trajectory does not reach target set perfectly. The simulation terminates when the closest point is reached

7.2. Dubins Car Model with Shortcut Path. The next example shows our algorithm can work with different dimensions in each mode, and is capable of choosing the best transition sequence. Consider a 2-mode hybridized Dubins Car system with identity reset map. We now add another 1-dimensional mode

to the system, and connect it with the other two modes by defining transitions. The vector fields, guards, and reset maps are defined in Table 6 and Table 7. In mode 1 and mode 2, the control is $u = (v, \omega)$; In mode 2, the control is $u = v$. Although the dynamics in mode 1 and mode 2 are not polynomials, they are approximated by 2nd-order Taylor expansion around $x = (0, 0, 0)$ in the numerical implementation. We are interested in solving the minimum time problem, where the trajectory starts at $x_0 = (-0.8, 0.8, 0)$ in mode 1, and ends at x, y-position $(0.8, -0.8)$ in mode 2. The optimal control problem is defined in Table 8.

Table 6: Vector fields and domains of the Dubins car model with shortcut path

Mode	$i = 1$	$i = 2$	$i = 3$
Dynamics	$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}0\\0\\0\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\cos(x_3(t)) & 0\\ \sin(x_3(t)) & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix} u$	$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}0\\0\\0\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\cos(x_3(t)) & 0\\ \sin(x_3(t)) & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix} u$	$\dot{x}(t) = 0 + (-1) \cdot u$
X_i	$[-1, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [-\pi, \pi] \subset \mathbb{R}^3$	$[-1, 1] \times [-1, 0] \times [-\pi, \pi] \subset \mathbb{R}^3$	$[-1, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$
U_i	$[0, 1] \times [-3, 3]$	$[0, 1] \times [-3, 3]$	$[0, 2]$

Table 7: Guards and reset maps of the Dubins car model with shortcut path. The rows are modes in which a transition originates, and the columns are modes to which the transition goes.

	Mode 1	Mode 2	Mode 3
Mode 1	$S_{(1,2)} = [-1, 1] \times \{0\} \times [-\pi, \pi]$ $R_{(1,2)}(x) = x, \quad \forall x \in S_{(2,1)}$	N/A	$S_{(1,3)} = [-1, 1] \times \{1\} \times [-\pi, \pi]$ $R_{(1,3)}(x) = 1, \quad \forall x \in S_{(1,3)}$
Mode 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mode 3	N/A	$S_{(3,2)} = \{-1\}$ $R_{(3,2)}(x) = (0.6, -0.8, 0)$, $\forall x \in S_{(3,2)}$	N/A

Table 8: Problem setup of Dubins car model with shortcut path

Mode	$i = 1$	$i = 2$	$i = 3$
h_i	1	1	1
H_i	0	0	0
x_0	$(-0.8, 0.8, 0) \subset X_1$	N/A	N/A
X_{T_i}	N/A	$\{0.8\} \times \{-0.8\} \times [-\pi, \pi] \subset X_2$	N/A
T	3		

Table 9: Results of the Dubins car example with shortcut path

	Computation time	Cost returned from optimization	Cost returned from simulation
$2k = 6$	83.0224[s]	1.5641	1.5739
$2k = 8$	1.2115×10^3[s]	1.5647	1.5679
$2k = 10$	1.3206×10^4[s]	1.5648	1.5703
Ground truth	N/A	1.5651	N/A

Notice the transition sequences "1-2" and "1-3-2" are both feasible in this instance according to our guard definition, but direct calculation shows that we may arrive at the target point in less time by taking the "shortcut path" in mode 3. This problem is solved using our algorithm with degrees of relaxation $2k = 6$,

$2k = 8$, and $2k = 10$. As comparison, we treat the analytically computed optimal control as ground truth, and the results are compared in Figure 3 and Table 9. In this example our algorithm is able to pick the transition sequence "1-3-2" and find a tight approximation to the true optimal solution.



(a) Control action: v



(b) Control action: ω



(c) Trajectory

Fig. 3: An illustration of the performance of our algorithm on a minimum time problem of the Dubins car model with shortcut path. The blue circle indicates the given initial point x_0, and the blue cross shows the target set. The blue solid line is the analytically computed optimal control, and the red lines of various saturations are controls generated by our method. As the saturation increases the corresponding degree of relaxation increases between $2k = 6$ to $2k = 8$ to $2k = 10$. Figure 3a, Figure 3b depict the control actions whereas Figure 3c illustrates the corresponding trajectory obtained by forward simulating through the system. The moment of transitions are indicated by vertical black solid lines in Figure 3a and Figure 3b.

7.3. SLIP Model. The Spring-Loaded Inverted Pendulum (SLIP) is a classical model that describes the center-of-mass dynamics of running animals and robots, and has been extensively used as locomotion template to perform control law synthesis on legged robots [20]. Despite its simplicity, an analytical solution to the SLIP dynamics does not exist. We may simulate the system numerically, but the optimal control problem is still difficult to solve if the sequence of transition is not known beforehand.



(a) SLIP model

(b) Active SLIP model

Fig. 4: Slip model and system variable definition



Fig. 5: SLIP locomotion phases and hybrid system modes

As is shown in Figure 4a, the SLIP is a mass-spring physical system, modeled as a point mass, M, and a mass-less spring leg with stiffness k and length l. The dynamics of SLIP consist of two phases: stance phase and flight phase. The stance phase starts when the leg comes into contact with the ground with downward velocity, which we call the *touchdown* event, and ends when the leg extends to full length and leaves the ground, which we call the *liftoff* event. During the stance phase, the inverted pendulum swings forward around the leg-ground contact point, while the spring contracts due to mass momentum and gravitational force. During flight phase, SLIP follows free fall motion where the only external force is the gravity. We also assume the leg angle is reset to some fixed value α instantaneously once the SLIP enters flight phase, so that the leg angle at the moment of touchdown stays the same. Furthermore, we define the *apex* event to be when the body reaches its maximum height with zero vertical velocity. The touchdown, liftoff, and apex events are illustrated in Figure 5.

In the context of this paper, we are interested in the active SLIP model (Figure 4b), where a mass-less actuator is added to the SLIP leg. During stance phase, the actuator may extend from its nominal position within some range, while during flight phase, the actuator has no effect on the system. The active SLIP can be modeled as a hybrid system with 3 modes, where the liftoff, apex, and touchdown events define the transitions between them, as shown in Figure 5.

Table 10: State variables of the active SLIP mode

l	leg length	a	horizontal displacement
$\dot{l}$	time derivative of l	$\dot{a}$	time derivative of a
θ	leg angle	b	vertical displacement
$\dot{\theta}$	time derivative of θ	$\dot{b}$	time derivative of b

Table 11: Physical parameters of the active SLIP model

	Explanation	Value
M	mass	1
k	spring constant	6
g_0	gravitational acceleration	0.2
l_0	nominal leg length	0.2
α	reset angle in flight phase	$\pi/6$

The behavior of such a system can be fully characterized using 8 variables defined in Table 10. In mode 1, we define the system state to be $x = (l, \dot{l}, \theta, \dot{\theta}, a)$; In mode 2 and mode 3, we define the system state to be $x = (a, \dot{a}, b, \dot{b})$. The physical parameters, dynamics, and transitions are defined in Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13. Again, we use 3rd-order Taylor expansion around $(l_0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ to approximate the stance phase dynamics with polynomials.

Table 12: Vector fields and domains of each of the modes of the active SLIP model

Mode	$i = 1$	$i = 2$	$i = 3$
Dynamics	$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_2(t) \\ -\frac{k}{M}(x_1(t) - l_0) - g_0\cos(x_3(t)) \\ x_4(t) \\ -\frac{2x_2(t)x_4(t)}{x_1(t)} - \frac{g_0\sin(x_3(t))}{x_1(t)} \\ -x_2(t)\sin(x_3(t)) - x_1(t)x_4(t)\cos(x_3(t)) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{k}{M} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u$	$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_2(t) \\ 0 \\ x_4(t) \\ -g_0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_2(t) \\ 0 \\ x_4(t) \\ -g_0 \end{bmatrix}$
X_i	$[0.1, 0.2] \times [-0.3, 0.3] \times [-1, 1] \times [-3, 0] \times [-1, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^5$	$[-1, 1] \times [0, 0.5] \times [0.15, 0.5] \times [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^4$	$[-1, 1] \times [0, 0.5] \times [l_0\cos(\alpha), 0.5] \times [-1, 0] \subset \mathbb{R}^4$
U_i	$[0, 0.1]$	N/A	N/A

Table 13: Guards and reset maps of the active SLIP model. The rows are modes in which a transition originates, and the columns are modes to which the transition goes.

	Mode 1	Mode 2	Mode 3
Mode 1	N/A	$S_{(1,2)} = \{x \in X_1 \mid x_1 = l_0, x_2 \geq 0\}$ $R_{(1,2)}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_5 \\ -x_2\sin(x_3) - l_0x_4\cos(x_3) \\ l_0\cos(x_3) \\ x_2\cos(x_3) - l_0x_4\sin(x_3)) \end{bmatrix}$, $\forall x \in S_{(1,2)}$	N/A
Mode 2	N/A	N/A	$S_{(2,3)} = \{x \in X_2 \mid x_4 = 0\}$ $R_{(2,3)}(x) = x, \quad \forall x \in S_{(2,3)}$
Mode 3	$S_{(3,1)} = \{x \in X_3 \mid x_3 = l_0\cos(\alpha)\}$ $R_{(3,1)}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} l_0 \\ -x_2\sin(\alpha) + x_4\cos(\alpha) \\ \alpha \\ -\frac{x_2}{l_0}\cos(\alpha) - \frac{x_4}{l_0}\sin(\alpha)) \end{bmatrix}$, $\forall x \in S_{(3,1)}$	N/A	N/A

We fix the initial condition, and consider the following two hybrid optimal control problems for the active SLIP: In the first problem, we maximize the vertical displacement b up to time $T = 2.5$. In stance phase, the 1st-order Taylor approximation $b = l\cos(\theta) \approx l$ is used; In the second problem, we define a constant-speed reference trajectory $a(t) = vt - 1$ in the horizontal coordinate, then try to follow this trajectory with active SLIP up to time $T = 4$. The optimal control problems are defined in Table 14. Note that these problems are defined such that the optimal transition sequences are different in each instance, and some modes are visited multiple times.

Table 14: Problem setup of SLIP

	Mode	$i = 1$	$i = 2$	$i = 3$
Maximizing vertical displacement	h_i	$-x_1$	$-x_3$	$-x_3$
	H_i	0	0	0
	x_0	N/A	N/A	$(-1, 0.3, 0.2, 0) \in X_3$
	X_{T_i}	X_1	X_2	X_3
	T	2.5		
Tracking constant-speed trajectory $a(t) = vt - 1$ with $v = 0.1$	h_i	$(v \cdot t - 1 - x_5)^2$	$(v \cdot t - 1 - x_1)^2$	$(v \cdot t - 1 - x_1)^2$
	H_i	0	0	0
	x_0	N/A	N/A	$(-1, 0.3, 0.2, 0) \in X_3$
	X_{T_i}	X_1	X_2	X_3
	T	4		

The optimization problems are solved by our algorithm with degrees of relaxation $2k = 4$, $2k = 6$, and $2k = 8$. For the sake of comparison, the same problems are also solved using GPOPS-II. Since GPOPS-II requires information about the transition sequence, we let the number of transitions to be less than 12, and iterate through all possible transition sequences with GPOPS-II. The results are compared in Figure 6 and Table 15.

Table 15: Results of the active SLIP

		Computation time	Cost returned from optimization	Cost returned from simulation
Maximizing vertical displacement	$2k = 4$	42.1805[s]	-0.7003	-0.5480
	$2k = 6$	722.5955[s]	-0.5773	-0.5577
	$2k = 8$	1.2290×10^4[s]	-0.5754	-0.5629
	GPOPS-II	1453.1083[s]	-0.5735	N/A
Tracking constant-speed trajectory $a(t) = vt - 1$ with $v = 0.1$	$2k = 4$	50.9472[s]	0.0422	0.38931
	$2k = 6$	835.4857[s]	0.2107	0.31507
	$2k = 8$	9.1429×10^3[s]	0.2165	0.31142
	GPOPS-II	844.3898[s]	0.2657	N/A



(a) Maximizing vertical displacement

(b) Tracking constant speed $v = 0.1$

Fig. 6: An illustration of the performance of our algorithm on active SLIP model. The blue lines are the optimal control computed by GPOPS-II by iterating through all the possible transition sequences, and the red lines of various saturation are controls generated by our method. As the saturation increases the corresponding degree of relaxation increases between $2k = 4$ to $2k = 6$ to $2k = 8$. Figure 6a shows trajectories that maximize vertical displacement, where the optimal solution goes through 3 transitions; Figure 6b shows trajectories that follow constant speed $v = 0.1$, where the optimal solution goes through 8 transitions.

REFERENCES

[1] A. D. Ames, H. Zheng, R. D. Gregg, and S. Sastry, *Is there life after zeno? taking executions past the breaking (zeno) point*, in American Control Conference, 2006, IEEE, 2006, pp. 6–pp.

[2] E. J. Anderson and P. Nash, *Linear programming in infinite-dimensional spaces: theory and applications*, John Wiley & Sons, 1987.

[3] M. ApS, *MOSEK MATLAB Toolbox. Release 8.0.0.53.*, 2017, http://docs.mosek.com/8.0/toolbox/index.html.

[4] S. C. Bengea and R. A. DeCarlo, *Optimal control of switching systems*, automatica, 41 (2005), pp. 11–27.

[5] L. D. Berkovitz, *Optimal control theory*, vol. 12, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[6] A. G. Bhatt and V. S. Borkar, *Occupation measures for controlled markov processes: Characterization and optimality*, The Annals of Probability, (1996), pp. 1531–1562.

[7] V. I. Bogachev, *Measure theory*, vol. 1, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.

[8] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, Cambridge university press, 2004.

[9] M. S. Branicky, V. S. Borkar, and S. K. Mitter, *A unified framework for hybrid control: Model and optimal control theory*, IEEE transactions on automatic control, 43 (1998), pp. 31–45.

[10] S. A. Burden, H. Gonzalez, R. Vasudevan, R. Bajcsy, and S. S. Sastry, *Metrization and simulation of controlled hybrid systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 60 (2015), pp. 2307–2320.

[11] M. Claeys, J. Daafouz, and D. Henrion, *Modal occupation measures and lmi relaxations for nonlinear switched systems control*, Automatica, 64 (2016), pp. 143–154.

[12] S. Dharmatti and M. Ramaswamy, *Hybrid control systems and viscosity solutions*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 44 (2005), pp. 1259–1288.

[13] M. Egerstedt, Y. Wardi, and H. Axelsson, *Transition-time optimization for switched-mode dynamical systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 51 (2006), pp. 110–115.

[14] M. B. Elowitz and S. Leibler, *A synthetic oscillatory network of transcriptional regulators*, Nature, 403 (2000), pp. 335–338.

[15] B. Griffin and J. Grizzle, *Walking gait optimization for accommodation of unknown terrain height variations*, in American Control Conference (ACC), 2015, IEEE, 2015, pp. 4810–4817.

[16] A. V. D. Heijden, A. Serrarens, M. Camlibel, and H. Nijmeijer, *Hybrid optimal control of dry clutch engagement*, International Journal of Control, 80 (2007), pp. 1717–1728.

[17] D. Henrion and M. Korda, *Convex computation of the region of attraction of polynomial control systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 59 (2014), pp. 297–312.

[18] A. Hereid, E. A. Cousineau, C. M. Hubicki, and A. D. Ames, *3d dynamic walking with underactuated humanoid robots: A direct collocation framework for optimizing hybrid zero dynamics*, in Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2016 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2016, pp. 1447–1454.

[19] M. W. Hirsch, *Differential topology*, vol. 33, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[20] P. Holmes, R. J. Full, D. Koditschek, and J. Guckenheimer, *The dynamics of legged locomotion: Models, analyses, and challenges*, Siam Review, 48 (2006), pp. 207–304.

[21] E. R. Johnson and T. D. Murphey, *Second-order switching time optimization for nonlinear time-varying dynamic systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 56 (2011), pp. 1953–1957.

[22] M. Korda, D. Henrion, and C. N. Jones, *Controller design and value function approximation for nonlinear dynamical systems*, Automatica, 67 (2016), pp. 54–66.

[23] T. G. Kurtz and R. H. Stockbridge, *Existence of markov controls and characterization of optimal markov controls*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 36 (1998), pp. 609–653.

[24] J. B. Lasserre, *Moments, positive polynomials and their applications*, vol. 1, World Scientific, 2009.

[25] J. B. Lasserre, D. Henrion, C. Prieur, and E. Trélat, *Nonlinear optimal control via occupation measures and lmi-relaxations*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 47 (2008), pp. 1643–1666.

[26] A. Majumdar, R. Vasudevan, M. M. Tobenkin, and R. Tedrake, *Convex optimization of nonlinear feedback controllers via occupation measures*, The International Journal of Robotics Research, (2014), p. 0278364914528059.

[27] S. Mohan, V. Shia, and R. Vasudevan, *Convex computation of the reachable set for hybrid systems with parametric uncertainty*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.01019, (2016).

[28] A. M. Pace and S. A. Burden, *Piecewise-differentiable trajectory outcomes in mechanical systems subject to unilateral constraints*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05645, (2016).

[29] A. Pakniyat and P. E. Caines, *On the relation between the minimum principle and dynamic programming for hybrid systems*, in Decision and Control (CDC), 2014 IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on, IEEE, 2014, pp. 19–24.

[30] B. Passenberg, M. Leibold, O. Stursberg, and M. Buss, *The minimum principle for time-varying hybrid systems with state switching and jumps*, in Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC), 2011 50th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 6723–6729.

[31] M. A. Patterson and A. V. Rao, *Gpops-ii: A matlab software for solving multiple-phase optimal control problems using hp-adaptive gaussian quadrature collocation methods and sparse nonlinear programming*, ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS), 41 (2014), p. 1.

[32] M. Posa, C. Cantu, and R. Tedrake, *A direct method for trajectory optimization of rigid bodies through contact*, The International Journal of Robotics Research, 33 (2014), pp. 69–81.

[33] A. Schollig, P. E. Caines, M. Egerstedt, and R. Malhamé, *A hybrid bellman equation for systems with regional dynamics*, in Decision and Control, 2007 46th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2007, pp. 3393–3398.

[34] M. S. Shaikh and P. E. Caines, *On the hybrid optimal control problem: theory and algorithms*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 52 (2007), pp. 1587–1603.

[35] N. Smit-Anseeuw, R. Gleason, R. Vasudevan, and C. D. Remy, *The energetic benefit of robotic gait selection: A case study on the robot ramone*, IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters, (2017).

[36] M. Soler, A. Olivares, and E. Staffetti, *Hybrid optimal control approach to commercial aircraft trajectory planning*, Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics, 33 (2010), pp. 985–991.
[37] H. J. Sussmann, *A maximum principle for hybrid optimal control problems*, in Decision and Control, 1999. Proceedings of the 38th IEEE Conference on, vol. 1, IEEE, 1999, pp. 425–430.
[38] R. Vasudevan, H. Gonzalez, R. Bajcsy, and S. S. Sastry, *Consistent approximations for the optimal control of constrained switched systems—part 1: A conceptual algorithm*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51 (2013), pp. 4463–4483.
[39] R. Vasudevan, H. Gonzalez, R. Bajcsy, and S. S. Sastry, *Consistent approximations for the optimal control of constrained switched systems—part 2: An implementable algorithm*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51 (2013), pp. 4484–4503.
[40] R. Vinter, *Convex duality and nonlinear optimal control*, SIAM journal on control and optimization, 31 (1993), pp. 518–538.
[41] Y. Wardi, M. Egerstedt, and M. Hale, *Switched-mode systems: gradient-descent algorithms with armijo step sizes*, Discrete Event Dynamic Systems, 25 (2015), pp. 571–599.
[42] T. Westenbroek and H. Gonzalez, *Optimal control of hybrid systems using a feedback relaxed control formulation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.09127, (2015).
[43] E. R. Westervelt, J. W. Grizzle, C. Chevallereau, J. H. Choi, and B. Morris, *Feedback control of dynamic bipedal robot locomotion*, vol. 28, CRC press, 2007.
[44] E. R. Westervelt, J. W. Grizzle, and D. E. Koditschek, *Hybrid zero dynamics of planar biped walkers*, IEEE transactions on automatic control, 48 (2003), pp. 42–56.
[45] K. Yunt and C. Glocker, *Trajectory optimization of mechanical hybrid systems using sumt*, in Advanced Motion Control, 2006. 9th IEEE International Workshop on, IEEE, 2005, pp. 665–671.
[46] P. Zhao, S. Mohan, and R. Vasudevan, *Control synthesis for nonlinear optimal control via convex relaxations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.00394, (2016).